

### REMARKS

The last Office Action has been carefully considered.

It is noted that claims 5-7, 9-11 and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 over the patent to Arai.

Claims 9-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over the patent to Appel in view of the patent to Arai under 35 U.S.C. 103. This rejection is not completely understood since most probably this rejection is based on a combination of the references and should be considered as 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over the patent to Arai in view of the patent to Appel.

Also, the claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112.

With the present Amendment applicant has amended claim 5 by introducing into it some features from claim 13, while the corresponding

features introduced in claim 5 have been removed from claim 13. Also, claim 14, the second independent claim, has been amended as well.

Turning now to the references and particularly to the new features of present invention which are defined in claim 5, it is respectfully submitted that in addition to other features, it is stated now that the wiper strip has a wiper lip which contacts the window, the wiper blade is constructed such that the wiper strip starts to tilt over in reversal positions in wiping direction of the wiper blade in a region of the reduced contact force and continues to tilt while moving to a region of a greater contact force against the window.

It is therefore believed to be clear that the inventive wiper device has a wiper lip which is pressed against the window and in reversal positions or near the reversal positions tilts over from one side to the other side. Due to the specific design of the carrying element as well as the thusly produced contact force distribution which is different than in the prior art, the abrupt snapping over of the entire wiper lip and the unpleasant noise is eliminated. The wiper lip starts in one or both outer points to tilt over and draws during movement of the wiper blade over the window to the regions of the wiper blade which have a greater contact force. The knocking noise

is reduced to a small central region, in which a part of the wiper lip as a whole can be tilted over and cause a softer knocking noise. Such a wiper device is not disclosed in the prior art and can not be derived from it as a matter of obviousness. It is not disclosed either in the patent to Arai or in the patent to Appel. Therefore it is believed that claim 5 as amended should be considered as patentably distinguishing over the art and should be allowed.

As for claim 14, this claim has been amended by applicant. It should be mentioned that in the applicant's opinion the Examiner's analysis of claim 14 is not accurate. The patent to Arai does not disclose any wiper blade whose curvature is greater in a central region than in the outer regions. Contrary to this, Figures 5 and 6 show the curvatures in the outer regions which are significantly greater than in the central region. It is possible that the Examiner meant to use the term "radius". The greater the radius (the flatter is an arc), the smaller the curvature. A greater curvature requires a smaller radius. Figures 5 and 6 in the patent to Arai do not disclose that the curvature in the central region is greater than or the radius of the central region is smaller than in the regions 3a.

Claim 14 has been particularly amended to define that the carrying element has the first and second sides, wherein the wiper strip is

arranged at the first side, while a connecting element is placed at the second side which is opposite to the first side. The carrying element in the region of the wiper strip has a concave curvature which in the central region is greater than in the end regions.

These features of the present invention are not disclosed either in the patent to Arai or in the patent to Appel. It is therefore believed that claim 14 should also be considered as patentably distinguishing over the art and should also be allowed.


As for the dependent claims, these claims depend on claim 5, they share its presumably allowable features, and therefore it is respectfully submitted that these claims should be allowed as well.

Reconsideration and allowance of present application is most respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the specification, claims and/or drawings be further amended or corrected in formal respects in order to place this case in condition for final allowance, then it is respectfully requested that such amendments or corrections be

carried out by Examiner's Amendment, and the case be passed to issue. Any costs involved should be charged to the deposit account of the undersigned (No. 19-4675). Alternatively, should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance, he is invited to telephone the undersigned (at 631-549-4700).

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Striker  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 27233